

REMARKS

Claims 2-4, 10-11 and 13-15 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 8 and 12 have been amended. Claims 1, 5-8 and 12 remain for further consideration. No new matter has been added. The rejections shall be taken up in the order presented in the Official Action.

The drawings currently stand objected to on the grounds that "10-24" and "16-20" are not illustrated in the figures. Page 3, line 8 of the specification currently states "...*a plurality of units 10-14*.". The undersigned believes the Examiner meant to say "10-14", rather than "10-24". The figures do indeed illustrate elements 10 – 14 (i.e., elements 10, 11, 12, 14 and 14). However, the occurrence of "10-14" on page 3, line 8 should be changes to "11-14". If the Examiner agrees, the undersigned authorizes an Examiner's amendment to change the occurrence of "10-14" on page 3, line 8 to "11-14".

The Official Action contends that elements "16-20" recited on page 3, line 9 are not included in the drawings. "16-20" is not a singular element number, rather elements 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20. A proposed drawing amendment is enclosed herewith to illustrate element #20 in the FIG. 1.

1. Claims 1, 8-9 and 12 currently stand rejected for allegedly being anticipated by the subject matter disclosed U.S. Patent 6,647,327 to Wolf et al (hereinafter "Wolf").

Claims 1 has been amended to include the features of claim 2. Claim 8 has been amended to include the features of claims 9 and 10. Claim 12 has been amended to include the features of claim 13. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection is now moot.

2. Claims 2-7, 10-11 and 13-15 currently stand rejected for allegedly being obvious in view of the combined subject matter disclosed in Wolf and U.S. Patent 6,683,886 to Van der Tujin (hereinafter “Van der Tujin”).

Claim 1 has been amended to include the features of claim 2. As amended, claim 1 recites that the incoming data is formatted as Bluetooth data. The Official Action states that Wolf fails to disclose that the incoming data is formatted as Bluetooth data (see Official Action, pg. 5, last ¶). The Official Action then contends that “*Van der Tujin teaches the motor vehicle MOST data network wherein said incoming data is formatted as Bluetooth data, ...*”. (Official Action, pg. 5, last ¶). However, it is respectfully submitted that this contention is based upon an overly broad and incorrect interpretation of the subject matter disclosed in Van der Tujin.

Contrary to the allegation in the Official Action, a fair and proper reading reveals that the contention in the Official Action “*Van der Tujin teaches the motor vehicle MOST data network wherein said incoming data is formatted as Bluetooth data, ...*” (emphasis added, Official Action, pg. 5, last ¶) is simply incorrect. A careful review of Van der Tujin indicates that this prior art reference neither discloses nor suggests a MOST data network. A MOST data network is simply not disclosed in Van de Tujin, contrary to the allegation in the Official Action that such a data network is disclosed.

Claims 8 and 12 are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 8 and 12 as amended are indeed patentable. The contention that Van de Tujin discloses a MOST data network is simply incorrect.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 5-8 and 12 is respectfully requested.

If a telephone interview could assist in the prosecution of this application, please call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Patrick O'Shea

Patrick J. O'Shea
Reg. No. 35,305
O'Shea, Getz & Kosakowski, P.C.
1500 Main Street
Springfield, MA 01115
(413) 731-3100, Ext. 102